

Classical and quantum quasi-free position dependent mass; Pöschl-Teller and ordering-ambiguity

S. Habib Mazharimousevi and Omar Mustafa*

*Department of Physics, Eastern Mediterranean University, G. Magusa, north Cyprus,
Mersin 10 - Turkey, Tel.: +90 392 6301078; fax: +90 3692 365 1604.*

We argue that the classical and quantum mechanical correspondence may have its say on the reliability of the ordering-ambiguity parameters. We use quasi-free position-dependent mass in the classical and quantum backgrounds. The Pöschl-Teller is used as a manifested reference effective potential to elaborate on the reliability of the ordering-ambiguity parameters available in the literature.

I. INTRODUCTION

The non-uniqueness in the presentation of the kinetic energy operator

$$T = \frac{1}{4} \left[m(x)^j p m(x)^k p m(x)^l + m(x)^l p m(x)^k p m(x)^j \right]$$

of the von Roos position-dependent mass (PDM) Hamiltonian [1] has inspired intensive research trends over the last few decades [1–34]. Searching for some physically and/or mathematically acceptable ordering-ambiguity parameters j , k , and l (subjected to von Roos constraint $j + k + l = -1$), it is found that the continuity conditions at the abrupt heterojunction between two crystals suggest that $j = l$, otherwise the heterojunction behaves like impenetrable barrier at which the wave functions vanish (cf., e.g., [11, 12, 28, 29, 32] for some details on this issue). However, in their study of the classical and quantum mechanical correspondence on the PDM harmonic oscillator, Cruz et al. [2] have shown that the special ordering $j = l = -1/4$ and $k = -1/2$ in the quantum picture is the one that gives rise to the potential term that is the same as the classical PDM oscillator (with no ordering-ambiguity conflict). Soon after, moreover, Mustafa and Mazharimousavi [12] have used a PDM psuedo-momentum operator along with an intertwining process and have shown that such special ordering (i. e., $j = l = -1/4$ and $k = -1/2$) is a strictly determined ordering. Similar arguments were reported by Cruz and Rosas-Ortiz in [13], by Koc et al. [28] and by Bagchi et al. [34].

We contemplate, however, that the classical and quantum mechanical correspondence may just be "the-other-way-around" in the ordering-ambiguity parametric fixation process as to which ordering is to be classified as "good" or "to-be-discarded". In this work, strictly speaking, we argue that the fixation of the ordering-ambiguity parameters may, very well, be sought through the classical observations of a given free PDM-particle moving under the influence of its own internally by-produced force field (hence the notion of quasi-free PDM-particle is unavoidably in point). That is, if the Lagrangian descendent equations of motion for a classical PDM-particle suggest that such classical particle is confined to move within a specific range, then bound-states solution should quantum mechanically be feasibly observed for the same PDM-particle. The opposite would also hold true, a classical PDM-particle that is unconfined to move within any specific finite range would correspond to a free particle textbook solution in quantum mechanics.

Under such simplistic classical and quantum mechanical correspondence, we organize our paper as follows. In section II, we give the essentials of a classical "free" PDM-particle choosing PDM functions at random for illustration purposes. We discuss the by-produced forces introduce by the PDM-particle itself. In the same section, moreover, we choose a 1D PDM-function where the corresponding quantum mechanical effective potential is of a Pöschl-Teller-type and reflect the classical and quantum mechanical observations on the admissibility of the ordering-ambiguity parameters. In section III, we discuss quasi-free PDM classical particle in 2D plane-polar coordinates and use some power-law-type PDM-function as constructive examples. Again, we use a 2D PDM-function that yields a Pöschl-Teller-type effective potential in quantum mechanics. Classical and quantum mechanical observations are reflected on the admissibility of the ordering-ambiguity parameters. Our concluding remarks are given in section IV.

*Electronic address: habib.mazhari@emu.edu.tr, omar.mustafa@emu.edu.tr

II. QUASI-FREE PDM CLASSICAL PARTICLE IN ONE-DIMENSION

In one-dimension (1D), the Lagrangian for a classical particle with position-dependent mass (PDM), $m(x) = m_0 M(x)$, moving in a free-force field (i.e., $V(x) = 0$) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{1}{2} m(x) \dot{x}^2. \quad (1)$$

Where only the kinetic energy term is involved in the Lagrangian. However, the equation of motion associated with such a Lagrangian is

$$m(x) \ddot{x} + \frac{1}{2} m'(x) \dot{x}^2 = 0, \quad (2)$$

where primes denote derivatives with respect to x and dots denote derivative with respect to time t . Obviously, one observes that whilst the PDM-particle is moving in an externally free-force field, its motion is influenced by the effect of its own internally byproducted-force field. Unlike the classical free particle with constant mass and zero acceleration, the quasi-free PDM-particle exhibits a deceleration or an acceleration of the form

$$\ddot{x} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{m'(x)}{m(x)} \dot{x}^2, \quad (3)$$

depending on whether the byproducted-force is damping or anti-damping, respectively. The signature of the ratio $m'(x)/m(x)$ determines the nature of the byproducted-force. That is, when $m'(x)/m(x) > 0$ the byproducted-force is a damping force (of frictional nature that slows down the particle) and when $m'(x)/m(x) < 0$ the byproducted-force is anti-damping (speeds up the PDM-particle). Moreover, when $m'(x)/m(x) = 0$ the classical constant mass settings are recovered. Such constant mass setting should not be considered here to avoid triviality.

Nevertheless, in a straightforward manner one may show that Eq.(3) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\ddot{x}}{\dot{x}^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{m'(x)}{m(x)} \implies \frac{d\dot{x}}{\dot{x}} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{dm(x)}{m(x)}. \quad (4)$$

Which upon integration would (with $x(t=0) = x_0$ and $\dot{x}(t=0) = \dot{x}_0$) result

$$\int_{\dot{x}_0}^{\dot{x}} \frac{d\dot{x}}{\dot{x}} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{x_0}^x \frac{dm(x)}{m(x)} \implies \sqrt{m(x)} \dot{x} = \sqrt{m(x_0)} \dot{x}_0. \quad (5)$$

Using $m_0 = m(x_0)$, $m(x) = m_0 M(x)$, $p_x = m(x) \dot{x}$ for the linear momentum, and $p_{x,0} = m_0 \dot{x}_0$ for the initial linear momentum, we may then recast (5) as

$$m(x) \dot{x} = m_0 \dot{x}_0 \sqrt{M(x)} \implies p_x = p_{x,0} \sqrt{M(x)}. \quad (6)$$

Clearly, this result implies that the linear momentum of the PDM-particle is not conserved (unlike the case where the linear momentum is conserved for a free-particle with constant mass). However, Eq. (5) suggests that only the linear momentum of the square root of the PDM-particle is conserved (in a metaphoric way so to speak). That is, if we defined a new physical quantity $\Pi = \sqrt{m(x)} \dot{x}$ as the PDM-quasi-linear momentum, then by the virtue of (5) one may conclude that this new physical quantity $\Pi \equiv \Pi(x, \dot{x})$ is conserved, i.e.,

$$\Pi(x, \dot{x}) = \Pi_0(x_0, \dot{x}_0). \quad (7)$$

However, a point canonical transformation of the form $q'(x) = \sqrt{m(x)}$ would imply that our Lagrangian in (1) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x}) = \frac{1}{2} m(x) \dot{x}^2 \implies \mathcal{L}(q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^2.$$

Our new Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(q, \dot{q})$ now represents the Lagrangian of a constant "unit mass" moving in q -space with a constant (i.e., conserved) linear momentum $p_q = \dot{q}$ and subjected to a force-free field $\ddot{q} = 0$. In this case, one may write

$$p_q = p_{q0} \implies \dot{q} = \dot{q}_0 \implies q(x) = \dot{q}_0(x_0) t = \Pi_0(x_0, \dot{x}_0) t. \quad (8)$$

Then, the equation of motion in (2) along with the results (3)-(7) are recovered. Moreover, one should notice that (8) gives the trajectory x of the PDM in terms of the initial quasi-linear momentum Π_0 and the time t .

A. An exponential-type 1D classical-PDM

Let us consider, for example, the set of 1D PDM-particles $m(x)$ that satisfies the condition

$$\frac{m'(x)}{m(x)} = 2Ax^n, \quad (9)$$

where A and n are two constants so that $\mathbb{R} \ni A \neq 0$, and $0 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. Such setting would form a special set of PDM-particles with mass functions given by

$$m(x) = m_0 \exp\left(\frac{2A}{n+1}x^{n+1}\right). \quad (10)$$

The quasi-linear momentum conservation condition in (7), in turn, yields (with $x_0 = 0$ for simplicity) a velocity of the form

$$\dot{x} = \dot{x}_0 \exp\left(-\frac{A}{n+1}x^{n+1}\right). \quad (11)$$

The internally byproducted-force of the PDM-particle in (10) is therefore

$$m(x) \ddot{x} = -A m(x) \dot{x}^2 x^n = -A (m_0 \dot{x}_0^2) x^n. \quad (12)$$

Obviously, it represents a set of non-static (i.e., depends on the initial velocity) position-dependent retarding-type forces that slow down the PDM-particles of (9) (i.e., the velocity decreases exponentially and goes to zero as $x \rightarrow \infty$). Here, unless otherwise mentioned, we have assumed that $\mathbb{R} \ni A > 0$ and A depends on the details of the problem at hand. Moreover, the PDM-particle (9) should be given a non-zero initial velocity $\dot{x}_0$ in order to move under the influence of its own byproducted-force field.

For the sake of illustration, we now take $n = 0$ in (9) to obtain

$$m(x) = m_0 \exp(2Ax), \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{x} = \dot{x}_0 \exp(-Ax), \quad (14)$$

and

$$m(x) \ddot{x} = -A (m_0 \dot{x}_0^2). \quad (15)$$

Next, we consider $n = 1$ in (9) to imply

$$m(x) = m_0 \exp(Ax^2), \quad (16)$$

$$\dot{x} = \dot{x}_0 \exp\left(-\frac{A}{2}x^2\right), \quad (17)$$

and

$$m(x) \ddot{x} = -A (m_0 \dot{x}_0^2) x. \quad (18)$$

For both examples, one clearly observes that for $\dot{x}_0 > 0$ ($\dot{x}_0 < 0$) and $A > 0$ ($A < 0$), the PDM-particle (10) starts from $x_0 = 0$ and moves a finite distance in the positive (negative) x -direction (ultimately stops at large enough distances). Moreover, for $\dot{x}_0 > 0$ and $A < 0$ the PDM-particles in (13) and (16) start from $x_0 = 0$ but this time speed up exponentially to infinity (i.e., $\dot{x} \rightarrow +\infty$) in the positive x -direction. However, whilst for $\dot{x}_0 < 0$ and $A > 0$ the PDM-Particle in (13) starts from $x_0 = 0$ and speeds up exponentially to the to an infinite speed (i.e., $\dot{x} \rightarrow -\infty$) in the negative x -direction, the PDM-particle in (16) would still move a finite distance in the negative x -direction and ultimately stops. This is documented in the manifestly retarding-type byproducted-forces in (15) and (18). Similar scenario tendencies would repeat themselves for even and odd values of n in (9).

B. A non-singular 1D-PDM; Classical and quantum mechanical observations

In this section, we consider the non-singular PDM-particle model

$$m(x) = \frac{m_0}{(1 + B^2 x^2)^2}, \quad (19)$$

and report some classical and quantum mechanical points of view. It should be mentioned here that Mustafa and Mazharimousavi [16] have provided a quantum mechanical d -dimensional recipe and reported exact solution for a specific ordering-ambiguity parametric set. In this work, however, we keep the ambiguity-parameters as they are and discuss the validity for these parameters.

1. Classical mechanical observations

Following our classical mechanical proposal above for the PDM-particle (19), one would use the quasi-linear momentum conservation condition in (7) to obtain

$$\dot{x} = \dot{x}_0 (1 + B^2 x^2), \quad (20)$$

and then use (3) along with (20) to get

$$\ddot{x} = 2B^2 \dot{x}_0^2 [x (1 + B^2 x^2)]. \quad (21)$$

There should be no doubt that such a classical PDM-particle would have an asymptotically infinite speed as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. A straightforward integration of (20) would imply that

$$x = \frac{1}{B} \tan(B\dot{x}_0 t + \arctan(Bx_0)) \in (-\infty, \infty).$$

The PDM byproducted-force is an anti-retarding/anti-damping force that causes an acceleration that grows asymptotically to infinity with a growing x (i.e., $\ddot{x} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$). The PDM-particle (19) is not confined to move within a specific range, therefore.

2. Quantum mechanical observations

Now we consider the PDM-particle of (19) using the PDM quantum mechanical von Roos Hamiltonian operator

$$H = \frac{1}{4} \left[m(x)^j p m(x)^k p m(x)^l + m(x)^l p m(x)^k p m(x)^j \right], \quad (22)$$

for a free-particle (i.e., $V(x) = 0$). Where the ordering-ambiguity parameters satisfy the von Roos constraint $j+k+l = -1$ and $p = -i\hbar\partial_x$. In a straightforward manner, one may show that the corresponding Schrödinger equation

$$H\psi(x) = E\psi(x),$$

would transform (using the substitution $\psi(x) = m(x)^{1/4} \varphi(q)$ along with the point canonical transformation (PCT) $q'(x) = \sqrt{m(x)}$) into

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(-\partial_q^2 + \frac{1}{4} (1 + 2k) \frac{m''(x)}{m(x)^2} - \left[\frac{9}{16} + j(j+k+1) + k \right] \frac{m'(x)^2}{m(x)^3} \right) \varphi(q) = E\varphi(q). \quad (23)$$

This, in turn, yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(-\partial_q^2 + \frac{4B^2}{m_0} (5a - 4b) \tan^2 \left(\frac{Bq}{\sqrt{m_0}} \right) - \frac{4a}{m_0} B^2 \right) \varphi(q) = E\varphi(q), \quad (24)$$

where

$$a = \frac{1}{4} (1 + 2k), \text{ and } b = \left[\frac{9}{16} + j(j+k+1) + k \right]. \quad (25)$$

Now we introduce the change of variables of the form $z = Bq/\sqrt{m_0}$ to obtain

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2m_0}\partial_z^2 + \frac{21(5a-4b)}{m_0 \cos^2(z)}\right) \varphi(z) = \mathcal{E} \varphi(z), \quad (26)$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{B^2}E + \frac{4}{m_0}(3a-2b). \quad (27)$$

Obviously, this is the one-dimensional Schrödinger equation for a Pöschl-Teller type effective-potential

$$V_{eff}(z) = \frac{2(5a-4b)}{m_0 \cos^2(z)} = \frac{1}{2m_0} \frac{\lambda(\lambda-1)}{\cos^2(z)} \quad (28)$$

that admits exact bound state solution for $\lambda > 1$ (i.e., $(5a-4b) > 0$). Such potential has impenetrable barriers manifested by the singularities at $z = -\pi/2$ and $z = \pi/2$. Quantum mechanically speaking, our PDM-particle in (19) would be confined to move between $x = -\sqrt{(e^{B\pi}-1)/(2B^2)}$ and $x = \sqrt{(e^{B\pi}-1)/(2B^2)}$ for $(5a-4b) > 0$ or equivalently for $\lambda(\lambda-1) > 0$. However, when $(5a-4b) = 0$ our PDM-particle is set free and the problem admits a textbook free particle solution. This would be in agreement with the classical mechanical predictions mentioned above. Two ordering-ambiguity parametric sets available in the literature satisfy this case. They are, Zhu and Kroemer's ($j = l = -1/2, k = 0$) and Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's ($j = l = -1/4, k = -1/2$) orderings [12]. On the other hand, Ben Daniel and Duke's ($j = l = 0, k = -1$) ordering satisfies the bound-states condition and contradicts with the classical mechanical observations, therefore. Yet, Gora and William's ($k = l = 0, j = -1$) and Li and Kuhn's ($k = l = -1/2, j = 0$) orderings yield $(5a-4b) < 0$ and would result imaginary eigenstates (hence, contradicting the classical observations)

III. QUASI-FREE PDM CLASSICAL PARTICLE IN 2D; PLANE-POLAR COORDINATES

Using the plane-polar coordinates, the Lagrangian for a free classical particle (i.e., moving in $V(r, \theta) = 0$) with position-dependent mass $m(r, \theta) = g(r)f(\theta)$ reads

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}m(r, \theta) \left(\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\theta}^2\right) = \frac{1}{2}g(r)f(\theta) \left(\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\theta}^2\right). \quad (29)$$

From which the descendent equations of motion yield

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{r}} \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial r} \implies \ddot{r} + \left(\frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right) \dot{r}^2 + \left(\frac{f'(\theta)}{f(\theta)} \right) \dot{r} \dot{\theta} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right) \left(\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\theta}^2 \right) + r\dot{\theta}^2, \quad (30)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\theta}} \right) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \implies \frac{d}{dt} \left[g(r)f(\theta) r^2 \dot{\theta} \right] = \frac{1}{2}g(r)f'(\theta) \left(\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\theta}^2 \right). \quad (31)$$

Whilst equation (30) for a constant $g(r) = 1$, say, results in

$$\ddot{r} + \left(\frac{f'(\theta)}{f(\theta)} \right) \dot{r} \dot{\theta} = r\dot{\theta}^2 \implies f(\theta)\ddot{r} + f'(\theta)\dot{r}\dot{\theta} = f(\theta)r\dot{\theta}^2, \quad (32)$$

equation (31) for a constant $f(\theta) = 1$, implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[g(r) r^2 \dot{\theta} \right] = 0. \quad (33)$$

Let us consider, for example, a plane-polar free PDM-particle with only a radially dependent mass (i.e., $m(r, \theta) = g(r), f(\theta) = 1$). In this case, equation (33) gives

$$m(r) r^2 \dot{\theta} = g(r) r^2 \dot{\theta} = p_\theta = K \implies g(r) r^2 \dot{\theta} = g(r_0) r_0^2 \dot{\theta}_0 \quad (34)$$

and equation (30) yields

$$m(r) \ddot{r} = g(r) \ddot{r} \implies \ddot{r} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \dot{r}^2 + \left(1 + \frac{g'(r)}{2g(r)} r\right) r \dot{\theta}^2, \quad (35)$$

where K is a constant. Using (34) and (35) along with the substitutions $\ddot{r} = v_r v_r'$; $v_r = \dot{r}$, $v_r' = dv_r/dr$, and $u(r) = v_r^2$ we obtain

$$(g(r) u(r))' = \frac{K^2}{r^2 g(r)} \left[\frac{2}{r} + \frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right] \implies g(r) u(r) - g(r_0) u(r_0) = \int_{r_0}^r \frac{K^2}{r^2 g(r)} \left[\frac{2}{r} + \frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right] dr. \quad (36)$$

A. A power-law type 2D classical-PDM

Now we consider the set of PDM functions of the form

$$m(r) = g(r) = m_0 \left(\frac{r}{r_0} \right)^\nu = \Lambda r^\nu, \quad (37)$$

where, $g(r_0) = m_0$, and $\Lambda = m_0 r_0^{-\nu}$. Equation (36) would then read

$$g(r) u(r) - g(r_0) u(r_0) = -\frac{K^2}{m_0 r_0^{-\nu}} [r^{-\nu-2} - r_0^{-\nu-2}]. \quad (38)$$

Consequently, one obtains

$$m_0^2 v_r^2 = \left(\frac{r_0}{r} \right)^\nu \left[m_0^2 v_{r_0}^2 + \frac{K^2}{r_0^2} \right] - \frac{K^2}{r_0^2} \left(\frac{r_0}{r} \right)^{2\nu+2}. \quad (39)$$

This result indicate that since the left-hand-side is zero or positive, so should be the right-hand-side. That is,

$$B_0^2 \left(\frac{r_0}{r} \right)^\nu - \tilde{K}^2 \left(\frac{r_0}{r} \right)^{2\nu+2} \geq 0; \quad B_0^2 = m_0^2 v_{r_0}^2 + \frac{K^2}{r_0^2}, \text{ and } \tilde{K}^2 = \frac{K^2}{r_0^2}. \quad (40)$$

Which, in turn, implies that

$$r^{\nu+2} \geq \left[\frac{\tilde{K}^2 r_0^{\nu+2}}{B_0^2} \right] \implies \begin{cases} r \geq r_0 \left[\frac{\tilde{K}^2}{B_0^2} \right]^{1/(\nu+2)} & \text{for } \nu > -2 \\ r \leq \frac{1}{r_0} \left[\frac{B_0^2}{\tilde{K}^2} \right]^{-1/(\nu+2)} & \text{for } \nu < -2 \end{cases}. \quad (41)$$

Clearly, one observes that for $\nu < -2$ our quasi-free radial PDM-particle in (37) would be confined to move a maximum radial distance

$$r_{\max.} = \frac{1}{r_0} \left[\frac{B_0^2}{\tilde{K}^2} \right]^{-1/(\nu+2)}, \quad (42)$$

whereas for $\nu > -2$ it would escape away to infinity.

For $\nu = -2$, nevertheless, the effect of $r \dot{\theta}^2$ in (35) would be eliminated and equation (39) reads

$$v_r^2 = \left(\frac{r_0}{r} \right)^{-2} v_{r_0}^2 \implies v_r = \frac{r}{r_0} v_{r_0}, \quad (43)$$

and (34) yields

$$\dot{\theta} = \frac{K}{m_0 r_0^2} \implies v_r \frac{d\theta}{dr} = \frac{K}{m_0 r_0^2}. \quad (44)$$

Next, substituting (43) in (44) implies that

$$r = r_0 \exp \left(\frac{m_0 r_0 v_{r_0}}{K} \theta \right). \quad (45)$$

This result suggests that when v_{r_0} is $(\pm)$ then r grows up from r_0 to infinity as θ starts from zero to $\pm\infty$, respectively, and a plane-spiral like trajectory is manifestly introduced, therefore. When v_{r_0} is $(\pm)$ and θ starts from zero to $\mp\infty$, respectively, then r shrinks down from some r_0 to the center of the spiral-like trajectory.

B. A non-singular 2D-PDM; Classical and quantum mechanical observations

In this section, we consider the non-singular radial PDM-particle model

$$m(r, \theta) = g(r) = \frac{\tilde{C}}{(1 + C^2 r^2)^2}, \quad (46)$$

where $\tilde{C} = m_0 (1 + C^2 r_0^2)^2$, and $g(r_0) = m_0$. We keep the ordering-ambiguity parameters as they are and discuss again the validity for these parameters.

1. Classical mechanical observations

Under such 2D plane-polar settings, our PDM-model in (46) would, when substituted in (36), yield

$$g(r) u(r) - g(r_0) u(r_0) = -\frac{K^2}{\tilde{C}} \left[\frac{(1 + C^4 r^4)}{r^2} - \frac{(1 + C^4 r_0^4)}{r_0^2} \right]. \quad (47)$$

Which would imply that

$$g(r) v_r^2 = \left[m_0 v_{r_0}^2 + \frac{K^2}{g(r_0) r_0^2} \right] - \frac{K^2}{g(r) r^2} \implies g(r) v_r^2 = \tilde{a}^2 - \frac{K^2}{g(r) r^2}, \quad (48)$$

where

$$\tilde{a}^2 = \left[m_0 v_{r_0}^2 + \frac{K^2}{g(r_0) r_0^2} \right],$$

is used for simplicity of calculations. Moreover, one may safely rewrite (with $\tilde{L} = \sqrt{\tilde{a}^2 \tilde{C} / K^2}$) equation (48) as

$$g^2(r) v_r^2 = \tilde{a}^2 g(r) - \frac{K^2}{r^2} \geq 0 \implies C^2 r^2 - \tilde{L} r + 1 \leq 0. \quad (49)$$

Which would, in turn, imply that

$$r_{\max} = \frac{\tilde{L}}{C^2} \pm \frac{\tilde{L}}{C^2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{C^2}{\tilde{L}^2}}. \quad (50)$$

Consequently, such PDM-model (46) would be confine to move within a specific range.

2. Quantum mechanical observations

The PDM von Roos Hamiltonian in plane-polar coordinates (cf., e.g., Mazharimousavi and Mustafa [19] for more details on this issue) for a free-particle (i.e., $V(r, \theta) = 0$) with $m(r, \theta) = g(r)$ in (46)

$$\frac{R''(r)}{R(r)} + \left(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right) \frac{R'(r)}{R(r)} + \frac{\xi}{2} \left(\frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right)^2 - \frac{(k+1)}{2} \left[\frac{g'(r)}{r g(r)} + \frac{g''(r)}{g(r)} \right] - \frac{m^2}{r^2} = -2g(r) E, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\xi = j(j-1) + l(l-1) - k(k+1), \quad (52)$$

and $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$ is the magnetic quantum number. We now substitute

$$R(r) = r^{-1/2} g(r)^{1/4} Q(q(r)), \quad (53)$$

with a PCT $q'(r) = \sqrt{g(r)}$ to obtain

$$g(r) \frac{Q''(q(r))}{Q(q(r))} - \frac{(m^2 - 1/4)}{r^2} + \left(\frac{8\xi - 7}{16} \right) \left(\frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right)^2 - \frac{k}{2r} \left(\frac{g'(r)}{g(r)} \right) - \left(\frac{2k+1}{4} \right) \left(\frac{g''(r)}{g(r)} \right) = -2g(r)E. \quad (54)$$

This equation, with $g(r)$ in (46), $q(r) = (\sqrt{C}/C) \arctan(Cr)$ and $z = Cq(r)/\sqrt{C}$ would read

$$\frac{Q''(z)}{Q(z)} - \frac{(m^2 - 1/4)}{\sin^2 z} + \left[\frac{8\xi - 8k - 12 - m^2 + 1/4}{\cos^2 z} \right] + \left(\frac{2E\tilde{C}}{C^2} - 8\xi + 12k - 1 \right) = 0. \quad (55)$$

Obviously, a Pöschl-Teller effective potential is obtained and the quantum particle in (46) moves between two infinite barriers at $z = 0$ and $z = \pi/2$ if and only if

$$8\xi - 8k - 12 - m^2 + 1/4 < 0, \text{ and } m^2 - 1/4 > 0 \implies |m| = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (56)$$

Although the S-states (i.e., states with the magnetic quantum number $m = 0$) are lost in the process, our quantum particle is still confined (if the conditions in (56) are satisfied, of course) to move between $r = 0$ and $r = \sqrt{(e^{C\pi} - 1)/(2C^2)}$. For $|m| = 1, 2$, one observes that while condition (56) is satisfied by Zhu and Kroemer's ($j = l = -1/2, k = 0$), Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's ($j = l = -1/4, k = -1/2$), Ben Daniel and Duke's ($j = l = 0, k = -1$), and Li and Kuhn's ($k = l = -1/2, j = 0$) orderings, Gora and William's ($k = l = 0, j = -1$) ordering fails to do so. However, for $|m| \geq 3$ we observe that all these orderings satisfy condition (56) and lead to bound-state solutions. Hence, quantum mechanical observations would be in agreement with the classical mechanical observations when condition (56) is satisfied.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work we argued that the fixation of the ordering-ambiguity parameters may, very well, be sought through the classical observations of a given free PDM-particle moving under the influence of its own internally by-produced force field. Namely, if a classical PDM-particle is free to move in an infinite range, then it should correspond to a free-quantum particle model and, therefore, admits free-particle wave solution. On the other hand, if a classical particle is confined to move within a specific finite range, then it should correspond to some bound-states problem in the quantum mechanical picture (of course, with the proper boundary conditions that may erupt in the corresponding quantum mechanical treatment).

In the process, we have provided the essentials of a classical "free" PDM-particles in 1D and 2D along with some random illustrative examples. We have discussed the by-produced forces introduced by the such PDM-particles. Moreover, we have deliberately chosen the PDM-functions ((19) for the 1D and (44) for the 2D cases) that yielded Pöschl-Teller-type effective potentials in the quantum mechanical treatment ((28) and (55), respectively). In so doing, we reflect our findings in the current work on Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's results in [16]. They have used similar PDM-particle subjected to no-force field but rather trapped in its by-produced Pöschl-Teller-type effective potentials and reported on the quantum bound-states in D-dimensions. Luckily, they have used Ben Daniel and Duke's parametric set ($j = l = 0, k = -1$). Strictly speaking, in both the 1D and 2D cases we have found that Ben Daniel and Duke's ordering satisfy bound states conditions. However, in the 1D case the bound-states quantum solution contradicts with the classical observations and therefore finds no classical correspondence (i.e., the classically PDM-byproduced-force is an anti-retarding/anti-damping force and the particle is unconfined, $x \in (-\infty, +\infty)$).

Finally, nevertheless, we have observed that Zhu and Kroemer's ($j = l = -1/2, k = 0$), and Mustafa and Mazharimousavi's ($j = l = -1/4, k = -1/2$) orderings have provided consistent quantum mechanical correspondence to the classical observations for the 1D and 2D cases. This would at least qualify these orderings as "reliable orderings". On the other hand, however, the Gora and William's ($k = l = 0, j = -1$) and Li and Kuhn's ($k = l = -1/2, j = 0$) orderings should be readily disqualified. Not only on the grounds of the continuity conditions at the abrupt heterojunction (where $j = l$ is sought) but also on the grounds of failing, at least, to provide a consistent quantum correspondence to classical observations in the 1D case. This does not necessarily mean to disqualify Ben Daniel and Duke's ($j = l = 0, k = -1$) as yet. More investigations have to be made.

- [2] S. Cruz y Cruz, J Negro, L. M. Nieto, Phys. Lett. **A 369** (2007) 400.
- [3] S H Mazharimousavi, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****41** (2008) 244016.
- [4] A Schmidt, Phys. Lett. **A 353** (2006) 459.
- [5] A Schmidt, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****42** (2009) 245304.
- [6] S H Dong, M Lozada-Cassou, Phys. Lett. **A 337** (2005) 313.
- [7] I O Vakarchuk, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Gen. **38** (2005) 4727.
- [8] C Y Cai, Z Z Ren, G X Ju, Commun. Theor. Phys. **43** (2005) 1019.
- [9] B Roy, P Roy, Phys. Lett. **A 340** (2005) 70.
- [10] B Gonul, M Kocak, Chin. Phys. Lett. **20** (2005) 2742.
- [11] A de Souza Dutra, C A S Almeida, Phys Lett. **A 275** (2000) 25.
- [12] O Mustafa, S.Habib Mazharimousavi, Int. J. Theor. Phys **46** (2007) 1786.
- [13] S. Cruz y Cruz, O Rosas-Ortiz, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.** **42** (2009) 185205.
- [14] J Lekner, Am. J. Phys. **75** (2007) 1151.
- [15] L Jiang, L Z Yi, C S Jia, Phys. Lett. **A 345** (2005) 279.
- [16] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 358** (2006) 259.
- [17] A D Alhaidari, Phys. Rev. **A 66** (2002) 042116.
- [18] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, J. Phys. **A: Math. Gen.** **39** (2006) 10537.
- [19] S H Mazharimousavi, O Mustafa; SIGMA **6**, (2010) 088.
- [20] B Bagchi, A Banerjee, C Quesne, V M Tkachuk, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Gen. **38** (2005) 2929.
- [21] J Yu, S H Dong, Phys. Lett. **A 325** (2004) 194.
- [22] C Quesne, Ann. Phys. **321** (2006) 1221.
- [23] T Tanaka, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Gen. **39** (2006) 219.
- [24] A de Souza Dutra, J. Phys. **A**; Math. Gen. **39** (2006) 203.
- [25] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Czech. J. Phys **56** (2006) 297.
- [26] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 357** (2006) 295.
- [27] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****41** (2008) 244020.
- [28] R Koc, G Sahinoglu, M Koca, Eur. Phys. J. **B48** (2005) 583.
- [29] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi, Phys. Lett. **A 373** (2009) 325.
- [30] O Mustafa, S H Mazharimousavi Phys. Scr. **82** (2010) 065013.
- [31] O. Mustafa, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****43** (2010) 385310.
- [32] O. Mustafa, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****44** (2011) 355303.
- [33] Y. Hamdouni, J Phys **A: Math. Theor.****44** (2011) 385301.
- [34] B. Bagchi, P. Gorain, C. Quesne and R. Roychoudhury, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A19** (2004) 2765